

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated January 24, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating the allowance of claims 26-35, and for indicating that claims 3-6, 9-12, and 20 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if amended to include all the features of a base claim and any intervening claim.

Claims 1-20, and 26-41 are pending, of which claims 1, 7, 16, 26, 31, 36, and 41 are independent. By this Response, claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 41 have been amended, and claims 3, 9, and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter disclosed therein.

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 13-19, and 41 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,360 – hereinafter Muller) and Steiss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,895,494 – hereafter Steiss). The Office Action contends that Muller discloses all of the claimed features except for the processing of instruction fields in parallel. To cure the deficiency of Muller, the Office Action applied Steiss as disclosing a Very Long Instruction Word (VLIW) processor for processing instructions in parallel. In response to the rejection, and in the interest of expediting the allowance of this application, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7, and 16 to include all of the features of dependent claims 6, 9, and 20, respectively. Accordingly, claims 3, 9,

and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, the pending obviousness rejection has been rendered as moot.

Further Applicants have amended independent claim 41, as shown above, to include the allowable features directed to a template means having a routine a routine associated with each protocol header. The amended features parallel the features in allowable claim 9, for example.

Applicants have further amended claims 7, 10, 12, 14, and 16 to improve the clarity of the claim recitations by adding “configured to” where appropriate.

By the amendments to independent claims 1, 7, 16, and 41, Applicants are not acquiescing to the obviousness rejection over Muller and Steiss, and Applicants reserve the right to file a continuation application in the future, as necessary, to claim the subject matter in original claims 1, 7, 16, and 41.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal and consideration of the obviousness rejection of claim 1-2, 7-8, 13-19, and 41 and to objection to claims 3-6, 9-12, and 20.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the claims 1-20, and 26-41 recites subject matter which neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited reference to Muller and Steiss. It is therefore respectfully requested that these pending rejections be withdrawn, and this application pass to issue with the allowance of pending claims 1-20, and 26-41.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Luan C. Do  
Registration No. 38,434

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

LCD:kzw